Dear Les,

7/14/83

Checking the King inventories for you reminded me of what I'd forgotten that pertains to search in my field offices consolidated case (the contempt one) and to this affidavit.

While much of it is not of likely story or column interest, there is content that you and perhaps some of Jack's younger associates might want to know, how the FBI can pretend to order an all-inclusive search and at the very same time "circumscribe" it. It is a standard technique.

In this case, they screwed the DJ investigation of them over what they did to King. But given what known about their so-called Office of Professional Responsibility, it would have been a whitewash anyway.

Can't you imagine what kind of investigation when the inventories didn't show a single tape?

But this FBI technique is worth knowing. As is their feigned indignation and bluster when they are asked or even mildly criticized.

You should see some of their memos about AGs!

And how wiretapping is more important than violating constitutional rights and even worth whatever the cost of losing the lawsuit if they were caught, as they said was probable. That is, losing suit.

The classic case is the Oswald case. The FBI's explanation of not telling the Dallas police about him is that they did not believe him capable of violence. And all the time he had hand-delivered a letter in which he threatened to blow the FBI up. In some versions also the Dallas police headquaters. Why is there any question? The FBI internal investigation, 13 years after the fact and after a leak, disclosed that after the assassination the case agent destroyed the noteon the SAC's direct order. After that, the case agent testified to the Warren Commission that he had no reason to believe that Oswald was capable of violance! (His own reports say that Oswald got drunk and beat his wife, but maybe that isn't violence to the FBI?)

This is the FBI when it expects the perpetual secrecy it was used to before FOIA- and one of the reasons FOIA is important.

The day of the assassination, according to the lieutenant in the Dallas police who later rose to the top, this case agent told him they knew Oswald was capable but didn't expect him to do anything. When that was reported to the chief and sworn to and the chief used that to defend his own police force, Hoover, without any inquiry, was loudly outraged and demanded a public apology. He got it, on coast-to-ocast TV and still wasn't satisfied. He broke all relations with the Dallas police, including ending FBI training. All because the Dallas police told the truth. That is the extreme to which the FBI goes to lie and to cover its ass, its first law. Best wishes,

P.S. I've just thought of something that just might make a major sensation - and be important.

Some years ago I sued the CIA for its records on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. There was the usual stonewalling and lack of real compliance but in several batches I got some fascinating records. I offered them to George Lardner, but the Post wasn't interested, so when an LATimes man (southern office) was here on a similar matter I offered them to him. They page-oned some of it, and then the Post came back and used some of the rest.

They actually had the kinds of things men carry in their pockets and wallets. Notes of calls to make, bills for personal purchaes, phone numbers, etc.

They also had - and this is what I write about - a series of reports on meetings with someone well placed and well informed about black matters, King, even what was in the White House mind or plans. He was really hot after King, called him a Chicom or under their influence, all sorts of farout things.

His name was omitted. But the space would exactly fit Reagan's show black, Pearce. Who seems to hold precisely the political views attributed to this source.

So, suppose an enterprising reporter took copies to Mr. Pearce and asked him a) is it true that you were an informer for the CIA and b) refused to let the CIA switch you to the FBI, because it was all illegal for the CIA? (FBI below him, demeaning.)

Not much to lose if he denies it, but what a story if he is the guy!

If it is not him, it is someone in his image.

My lawyer, in Bud's office, has copies.

If I remember correctly, the court's copies suffered a mysterious disappearance. It can still be checked and the reporter was Jeff Prugh, good fellow.